

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. (US 5,184,236) in view of Kim (US 6,177,970).

Claims 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. (US 6,215,541) in view of Kim.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Kim and Kim et al. (US 6,388,727).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-18 are pending for consideration with claims 9-18 being withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. (US 5,184,236) in view of Kim (US 6,177,970), claims 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. (US 6,215,541) in view of Kim, and claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Kim and Kim et al. (US 6,388,727). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references, either applied singly or in combination, that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1 and 4, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

Independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, both recite a liquid crystal display device wherein “the alignment film contacts the common line and source and drain electrodes of the thin film transistor.” In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention and acknowledged by the

Office Action, Miyashita et al. is completely silent with regard to an alignment layer contacting a common line. In further contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Kim merely shows, in FIG. 5, for example, an alignment layer 90 contacting only a pixel portion 40 of the drain electrode 720. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Miyashita et al. and Kim fail to teach or suggest all the features of at least amended independent claims 1 and 4, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Song et al. nor Kim et al. remedies the deficiencies of Miyashita et al. and Kim. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that Song et al. and Kim et al. are both completely silent with regard to an alignment layer contacting source and drain electrodes of a thin film transistor.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of Miyashita et al., Song et al., and Kubo et al., whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests the novel combination of features of amended independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: 

Robert J. Goodell  
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: April 5, 2005

**Customer Number: 009629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202)739-3000